



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 25 and 26 September 2019

Site visit made on 26 September 2019

by Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/19/3228261

Land adjacent to caravan site, Beech Farm Road, Warlingham CR6 9QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Brien against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2017/2377, dated 21 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is material change of use of land for stationing of four static caravans for residential occupation by gypsy-travellers with new access, access track, hard standing, utility block, cess pool, storage area for up to four touring caravans and fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issues

2. The appeal site has been in use as a gypsy and traveller caravan site without planning permission since 2016. At the time of my site visit there were two mobile homes on the site.
3. A Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) dated 21 August 2019 between the appellant and the Council sets out the matters that are agreed and those that are disputed. The site lies in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The main parties agree that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 16 of 'Planning policy for traveller sites' (PPTS) and fails to maintain Green Belt openness.
4. The SOCG also indicates that the Council has withdrawn the reason for refusal relating to the sustainability of the location (4th reason). Before the inquiry opened it was also confirmed that the Council did not wish to pursue the reason for refusal relating to the effects on the quiet enjoyment of the leisure plot to the north of the appeal site (6th reason).
5. A separate SOCG submitted before the inquiry records that the highway matter not agreed is whether a safe access can be provided without a legally binding agreement with adjoining landowners for the creation and maintenance of the necessary visibility splays.
6. Taking into account the written evidence, the SOCG, what I heard at the inquiry and my site visits to the site and surroundings, the main issues are:
(1) the traveller status of the existing and proposed site occupants;

- (2) the effect on Green Belt openness and purposes;
- (3) the effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- (4) the effect on biodiversity;
- (5) whether a safe and suitable vehicular access can be achieved; and,
- (6) whether the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the development.

Reasons

Traveller Status

7. The intention is that the site would be occupied by an extended family of Irish Travellers. These would comprise the appellant (hereafter referred to as John Brien Snr), his wife and their younger daughter, and three of his older children together with their own families. Two of the families, those of John Brien Snr and John Brien Jnr, are currently using the site as a base.
8. A short statement about the intended site occupants was submitted in advance of the hearing. Further information was provided during the round table discussion and in the oral evidence of John Brien Jnr and Michael Casey. No documentary evidence was produced to support the written and verbal evidence.
9. However, the evidence taken together provides a picture of families who have travelled for an economic purpose for many years. Although John Brien Snr appears to have used the sites at Beech Farm Road as a base for his family for a long time, stating that he has been there most of his life, it would appear that he has always travelled to find work, both home and abroad. He normally takes his wife and younger daughter with him. He and his immediate family were away at the time of the inquiry.
10. The men of the other families have also been on the road since reaching adulthood, now taking their families with them for some of the time. The men often travel together, obtaining construction and landscaping work by knocking on doors and leafleting. The families attend traditional traveller events such as the horse fairs at Appleby and Stow.
11. The appeal site would provide a base for the extended family. The intention would be for the younger children to attend the local primary school when they reach school age and are not travelling. One of the children already has her name down.
12. Based on the information before me those travellers who currently reside on the site and those who intend to do so are of a nomadic habit. The cessation of travelling would be so that the educational needs of the younger children could be met. The families meet the planning definition of 'gypsies and travellers' set out in PPTS. Therefore, PPTS, which sets out the Government's policy for traveller sites applies, as do development plan policies relevant to travellers.

Green Belt openness and purposes

13. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

14. The site is within a large expanse of the Metropolitan Green Belt. It was previously free from development. The stationing of mobile homes and tourers, the formation of an access and driveway with tall gates, the parking of vehicles on a large area of hardstanding, the erection of a utility block, the enclosing of some of the site boundaries with high fencing and the domestic paraphernalia associated with the use, would lead in spatial terms to loss of openness.
15. Openness has a visual dimension as well as a spatial aspect. The fencing and the upper parts of the mobile homes, touring caravans and building would be visible from Beech Farm Road or down the driveway. The hard-surfaced access and driveway and the gates would also be seen from the road. It is also likely that glimpses of vehicles would be visible from Beech Farm Road and some domestic activity would be noticed when the gates are open. I was not made aware of any other viewpoints from where the development would be readily seen.
16. The development would conflict with the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment because it would lead to structures, hardstandings and activity where there was none before.
17. That said there are factors which affect the level of harm to the Green Belt. The majority of the site forms part of a narrow, contained parcel of land running north-eastwards from a group of buildings and caravans served by a separate access. Moreover, there are already caravans and other structures nearby, many of which are authorised. The development would not be an isolated incursion into a swathe of open Green Belt. There would also be the scope to soften the effects of the development by providing planting around the site boundaries and alongside the southern edge of the driveway.
18. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the mitigating factors, there would be a significant loss of Green Belt openness and a clear conflict with the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Green Belt harm would be significant.

Character and appearance

19. There is no Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment before me and limited evidence about landscape and visual effects. However, information accompanying the appeal indicates that the site lies within the Woldingham to New Addington Open Chalk Farmland Landscape Character Area (LCA) as defined in the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment 2015. The characteristics of the LCA are said to include large scale, open arable fields with some blocks of ancient woodland, hedgerows and tree belts.
20. The site also falls within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), a local designation that extends across a large tract of countryside which is the width of Surrey. Local landscape designations are not referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The preferred approach is for planning decisions to be based on relevant criteria in relation to landscape rather than 'blanket' local designations. That said a review of the AGLV in 2007 indicated that parts of it, including the area where the appeal site lies, shares identical characteristics to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and should be included in an extended AONB. Whilst that proposal has not been taken forward, in the absence of other significant

evidence, I consider that the site lies within a valued landscape as referred to in paragraph 170 of the Framework.

21. In terms of the particular landscape effects of the development, the site lies on a plateau with a steep sided dry valley dropping away to the east. The plateau contains isolated farmsteads and dwellings, small areas of woodland and other groupings of buildings, including that to the south-west of the appeal site. The proposal has replaced part of an open field and a well-treed parcel of land with a hard-surfaced access road, high gates and an area of hard landscaping partly enclosed by urban style fencing. It would result in a relatively narrow finger of development on the plateau intruding out from the nearby group of buildings and caravans. It should be assumed that the intervening land between the appeal site and the authorised development is undeveloped in the absence of any permission. Thus, the proposal does not represent an organic extension of the existing pocket of development. There would be the scope to introduce some planting to soften the impact but there would be some localised adverse landscape effects.
22. That said, the appeal site is not part of a large scale, open arable field. It contained some trees but there is no evidence that it was an ancient woodland or formed part of a tree belt. The area of woodland which lies within the large rectangular plot immediately to the north would not be affected. The site did not appear to display any of the characteristics of the LCA referred to above.
23. Despite the local topography, I was told that the development would not be visible from roads and footpaths to the east. From the west, views would be mainly those obtained by passing motorists described in paragraph 15 above. Some cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians may use Beech Farm Road. But I would anticipate that such users would be focusing on the road and traffic rather than taking in views of the surrounding countryside. Otherwise the development would be well contained by existing development, the woodland to the north and roadside banks and vegetation. In these respects, the development would not appear to be visible to sensitive visual receptors such as walkers using local footpaths. The development would be visible to an extent from the permitted caravan sites and bungalow to the south. However, the site is tidy, there are no objections from those nearby residents, and there is nothing else before me to suggest that they would be sensitive to the changes.
24. Therefore, in conclusion, the landscape effects would be moderately adverse, taking into account the value of the wider landscape within which the development lies. The visual effects would be minor adverse.
25. The extent to which those adverse effects could be mitigated by soft landscaping is not sufficiently clear. The layout plan submitted with the application shows only limited landscaping to the eastern boundary. The laurel hedging recently planted on a small bank on the same boundary is not appropriate in this rural setting. No alternative landscaping proposals are before me. The possibility of requiring a site development scheme by condition was discussed at the inquiry but, taking into account the need to accommodate four pitches, the utility building and the associated areas of hardstanding, there may be limited space left for landscaping. The site has not been well planned and soft landscaped.

26. The proposal would result in some adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area. Whilst Policy CSP 9 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (CS) and PPTS recognise that traveller sites can be located in rural areas, should not be completely hidden and some mitigation may be possible, the caravans and other elements of the development would not conserve, enhance or reinforce the special landscape character of the area or ensure that landscaping is an integral element of the layout. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CSP 18, CSP 20 and CSP 21 of the CS and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (LP Part 2). The development would not contribute to protecting and enhancing a valued landscape as required by the Framework.
27. The Inspector who determined the recent appeal for a traveller caravan site of four pitches to the south of the site did not find any harm to character and appearance¹. However, in that case the development is tucked behind the existing bungalow and traveller site and has no close public views. Moreover, it would appear from the decision that the issue of whether the locality fell within a valued landscape was not subject to much debate at the inquiry.

Biodiversity

28. Trees and other vegetation were cleared to make way for the development. No surveys were conducted by the appellant in advance of site clearance to ascertain whether the site had value as a habitat for protected species or contained other notable flora or fauna.
29. The Council has not produced any information about the presence of protected species hereabouts. The trees were not protected by a preservation order. The condition imposed on the 1998 appeal decision for a gypsy caravan site on land to the south-west which required a landscaping scheme incorporating the retention of the wooded area on the appeal site was not discharged or enforced against and no longer has effect. The site currently has little value as a habitat as it is hard-surfaced.
30. Overall, balancing the failure of the appellant to assess whether the site had any value before undertaking works against the factors set out in paragraph 29, I conclude that it is likely that there has been some harm to biodiversity and, therefore, conflict with Policy CSP 17 of the CS and Policy DP7 of the LP Part 2. To find no harm would be to condone the clearance of the site in advance of seeking planning permission. Implementation of a landscaping scheme which could include measures to encourage nesting birds and other fauna would be capable of mitigating some of the harm but how much could be achieved is not clear from the information before me.

Vehicular access

31. The vehicular access into the site is on the inside of a gradual bend in the road. Speed surveys conducted on behalf of the appellant indicate that, with a 2.4m set back ('X' distance), splays of about 40m to the north and 46m to the south would provide acceptable visibility in accordance with Manual for Streets (MfS). However, splays of these dimensions would go across third party land.
32. Before and during the inquiry the appellant suggested that a 2m 'X' distance' to the south would be acceptable as approaching vehicles would be on the far side

¹ Appeal decision ref: APP/M3645/W/18/3205027 dated 8 July 2019

- of the carriageway. Such a set-back has not been considered by the Highway Authority. However, having considered the advice within MfS and looked at a 2m set back at the site visit, including the extent that a vehicle's bonnet would need to protrude onto the highway, it seems to me that visibility to the south would be acceptable without the need to rely on third party land. Given the width of the carriageway and its alignment it is highly unlikely that approaching traffic would seek to overtake. Oncoming traffic would be visible in good time.
33. In terms of the splay to the north, it is clear that it involves land in private ownership, whether the 'X' distance is 2.4m or 2m. An e-mail from the adjoining landowner has been provided indicating that the appellant may go onto the land at any time to clear brambles and scrub. The land has recently been cleared such that when I visited the site visibility to the north was acceptable. However, although the e-mail suggests consent to maintain the splay exists at the moment, it is not binding, and the owner could change their mind or land ownership could change. There is insufficient certainty that the splay would be retained for the lifetime of the development. It was agreed at the inquiry that the splay is necessary to make the proposal acceptable in highway safety terms.
34. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that it may be possible to require works on land not controlled by the applicant by using a condition worded in a negative form (a Grampian condition). Such a condition would prohibit development or another key aspect, such as occupation, until a specified action has occurred. However, in this case the development has already commenced, and the site is partly occupied. A Grampian style condition requiring that the visibility splays be provided and maintained would not appear to meet the tests of reasonableness and enforceability.
35. In any event such a condition would require a binding agreement between the appellant and the landowner to give it effect. No such agreement is in place. The PPG advises that a negatively worded condition which requires the applicant to enter into a planning obligation or other agreement is unlikely to pass the test of enforceability. Such an agreement should be in place before planning permission is granted. The exceptions referred to in the guidance do not apply in this case. It is not a complex development scheme where delivery is at risk, there have not been meaningful discussions between the appellant and the Council about the need for an agreement, and there are no heads of terms.
36. The existing access to the south which serves the two authorised traveller sites and bungalow has poor visibility to the north. Highway safety was not raised as an issue in the recent appeal, although it was a main consideration in the 1998 decision and an improved sight line was required by condition. However, it would not appear that the condition has been enforced. The inadequacy of an existing access is not a good reason to allow another access where safety could be compromised.
37. For the above reasons there is no certainty that a safe and suitable vehicular access can be maintained. The proposal would conflict with Policy DP5 of the LP Part 2 and paragraph 108 of the Framework as the access would have the potential to create hazards for vehicle occupants and other road users.

Other considerations

Need for and provision of sites

38. The CS was supported by a Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) that identified a need for 63 pitches between 2013 and 2028 of which 48 pitches were required in the first five-year period. Only some 9 pitches have been granted permanent permission since the base date of the CS and all of those have been in the last year.
39. The Council has published another GTAA (2017). It is being used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan (eLP) which is currently being examined. The 2017 GTAA seeks to distinguish between those existing travellers in the area that meet the PPTS definition and those that do not. I give limited weight to the policies of the eLP and its supporting evidence base insofar as they relate to travellers because there are unresolved objections to these elements; the Examining Inspector has raised questions on the issues; and the policies may be modified. That said the Council agreed that the 2017 GTAA points to the need for a minimum of 20 pitches between 2016 and 2033.
40. It is not for me in connection with an appeal to consider in detail what the need is likely to be. That is a matter for the eLP examination. However, in my judgement and taking a broad-brush approach, the need is likely to be significantly higher than that suggested by the 2017 GTAA. The return of 4 households who definitely meet the PPTS definition out of a total of 47 traveller households seems very low. There are a significant number of outstanding and refused applications on existing traveller sites which suggests a current pressing need. The considerable fall in assessed needs between the two GTAAs is surprising, notwithstanding the changed definition.
41. In addition, those travellers who do not meet the definition are still likely to be in need of a caravan pitch. The Council says that their needs will be considered as part of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). However, there is no evidence before me that the SHMA has assessed such needs or that the eLP will address those needs through planning policies as required by paragraph 61 of the Framework.
42. These sorts of issues were raised in the July 2019 appeal decision. The Council has responded to these issues and the points made in representations to the examining Inspector through a submission to the examination². However, whilst the paper clarifies some points, it does not, in my judgement, materially detract from the Inspector's findings that there is a significant need for pitches in the District.

Alternative sites

43. The Council could not point to any suitable alternative sites that are available for the existing and proposed site occupants. The site nearby originally used by the appellant has been taken up by the extended family of his brother, Patrick, the owner of that site.
44. On the face of it the public site at Pendell Camp has some vacant pitches. However, the site was described as an utter mess and subject to anti-social

² Evaluation of the GTAA 2017 and TDC's approach to Traveller applications – September 2019

behaviour. No contradictory evidence was provided to suggest that suitable pitches were available for the families intending to occupy the appeal site.

45. The Council has not made any allocations through the CS or LP Part 2 and the eLP does not propose any allocations. The eLP refers to the possibility of the South Godstone Garden Community providing an opportunity to deliver some traveller accommodation. However, if this is to come to fruition, it will require an Area Action Plan. Any pitches that are delivered will be towards the end of the plan period (2033) so are not available for the families now.

Failure of policy

46. The Council does not have a 5-year supply of pitches against the need set out in the tested GTAA which supported the CS. Whilst the recent permissions meet the short-term needs identified within the 2017 GTAA, for the reasons given I attach limited weight to that evidence. There is a considerable shortfall in supply against the real short-term needs.
47. The development plan has not to date made any allocations for traveller pitches. Despite Policy CSP 9 indicating that a Site Allocations Development Plan Document would make provision for sites, it has never happened. Instead the Council has relied on the criteria within Policy CSP 9. This approach does not accord with Policy B of PPTS. The eLP seeks to largely repeat these failings.
48. Some 94% of the District is in the Green Belt, including all areas of countryside. The Council acknowledges that most new traveller sites will be in the Green Belt. However, in relying on criteria which include the need to demonstrate very special circumstances, the Council could be seen as setting the bar higher for applications than for allocations in the Green Belt which require exceptional circumstances to be fully evidenced and justified as part of a Plan-led approach. This is reflected in the limited number of permissions since the adoption of the CS and failure to determine other longstanding applications.
49. There has been a persistent and woeful failure of policy.

Personal circumstances

50. The extended family of John Brien Snr have a longstanding connection to the area. The families are in need of a settled base. Two of the families are still stopping on the side of the road, doubling up on pitches or staying on illegal encampments or other unauthorised sites. The two other families would have had to do the same if they had not remained on the appeal site.
51. There is one child of secondary school age, but she is home-tutored. One child has recently reached school age and hopes to start at a local primary school soon. There are three other children of pre-school age and a further two unborn who it is said would also go to a local school if the families were able to remain on the appeal site. Being able to stay on the site would allow these children to commence and then continue with their education.
52. One of the adults who is occupying the site has a longstanding health condition which is treated at a local hospital. I was not made aware of any other particular health needs but those on the site are registered with the medical centre in Warlingham and the other families would do so.

53. The benefits of a settled base are well-documented in terms of education and access to health care. There would also be advantages for the general well-being of the families in being settled and having continual access to basic amenities and a secure living environment. In particular a settled base would be in the best interests of the children and their education, health, safety and welfare.

Sustainability

54. The Inspector who made the July 2019 decision found that the nearby four pitch traveller site was within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities. The same circumstances are applicable in this appeal.
55. A settled base would achieve the sustainability benefits set out in paragraph 13 of PPTS, in particular access to health services and school, reducing the need for long-term travelling and environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment, and a reflection of the traditional lifestyles of living and working from the same location. The site would provide a suitable living environment, is not at risk from flooding and would not result in undue pressure on local infrastructure and services. There is nothing to suggest that a peaceful and integrated co-existence between those who would be on the site and the local community could not be achieved.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

56. The Framework requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
57. The proposal would represent inappropriate development which attracts substantial weight. In terms of other harm, substantial weight should also be attached to the harm caused to Green Belt openness and the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
58. I have also found harm in relation to the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity to which I attach moderate and limited weights respectively. The harm to highway safety should be afforded substantial weight because of the dangers that could be caused.
59. In terms of factors in favour, significant weight should be afforded to each of the following - the unmet need for traveller sites in the District, the lack of alternative sites and the failure of policy in providing sites and a five-year supply. In relation to failure of policy the Council has not complied with its duties under the Housing Act 1985 (as amended) and is in breach of the Equality Act 2010 as, in contrast to traveller sites, a five-year supply of sites for the settled community has been provided. The fact that new traveller sites are likely to be in the Green Belt should also be given significant weight in favour of the appeal. Meeting the sustainability considerations set out in PPTS is also a factor in favour to which moderate weight should be attached. Putting to one side the particular circumstances of the existing and proposed traveller occupants of the site, there are positive implications for the human rights of travellers and best interests of traveller children in general from increasing the supply of traveller pitches.

60. The personal circumstances of the families and in particular their need for a settled base is a consideration in favour. This factor should be afforded moderate weight in the planning balance as the needs are not out of the ordinary. That said, overall the best interests of the children, which is a primary consideration and which attracts substantial weight, would be met by the provision of a settled base. In addition, a settled base would meet the Article 8 Human Rights Act requirements of the families' right to a home and a private and family life and allow the group to live together as part of their traditional way of life.
61. Overall, my conclusions are that the Green Belt harm by reason of inappropriate development, loss of openness and effect on a Green Belt purpose, together with the harm to character and appearance, biodiversity and highway safety, are not clearly outweighed by other considerations - the unmet need for traveller sites in the District, the lack of alternative sites, the failure of policy in providing sites and a 5 year supply, the fact that new traveller sites are likely to be in the Green Belt, the personal circumstances of the site occupants and the sustainability benefits. These considerations, taken together with the equality, human rights and best interests of the children benefits which flow from additional provision, are not sufficient to constitute the very special circumstances necessary to justify permission. My conclusions have taken into account that, subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances³.
62. The proposal would conflict with Policy CSP 9 of the CS and Policies DP10 and DP13 of the LP Part 2 as very special circumstances have not been demonstrated. I have also found conflict with Policies CSP 17, CSP 18, CSP 20 and CSP 21 of the CS and Policies DP5 and DP7 of the LP Part 2. The proposal would conflict with the development plan overall. Material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
63. In reaching the above conclusions, I have considered whether conditions could make the development acceptable. However, for the reasons given in paragraphs 25, 30, 34 and 35 I have insufficient information before me to convince me that conditions could mitigate some of the harm and meet the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework and the PPG.
64. I have also considered whether a temporary permission would be appropriate as an alternative to dismissing the appeal on the basis that planning circumstances may change at the end of such a period. A temporary permission would time-limit the Green Belt harm and that caused to the character and appearance of the area and highway safety. Allowing the families to occupy the site for a period would be in the best interests of the children, prevent hardship and ensure that their Human Rights would not be interfered with.
65. However, the eLP does not propose to allocate sites and the South Godstone Garden Community is a longer-term aspiration. Although the examination of the eLP may result in a change in approach (e.g. the introduction of site allocations), the outcome, both in terms of what policies will eventually be adopted and when, is far from certain. I was not made aware of any changes

³ PPTS para 16

in provision that are likely to take place in the wider area. Moreover, I am mindful of paragraph 27 of the PPTS in relation to temporary planning permissions in the Green Belt. Furthermore, a further period of occupation of the site would perpetuate the substantial harm to the Green Belt and other harm which would not be outweighed by other material considerations. In particular, there is too much doubt about whether a safe access can be maintained even for a temporary period.

66. Dismissal of the appeal could result in the Council pursuing enforcement action such that the families could not live on the site. If they have nowhere else to stay this would lead to a return to a roadside existence. I have carefully considered whether such a result would be proportionate in the circumstances have regard to Human Rights provisions, including the right to a home and family life and the positive obligation to facilitate a gypsy way of life. I have also had particular regard to the best interests of the children as a primary consideration. However, the environmental harm and safety concerns which would continue to be caused by the development would be considerable. Taking into account all material considerations I am satisfied that these legitimate objectives can only be adequately safeguarded by dismissal of the appeal.
67. I have also had due regard to the public sector equality duty at Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. However, the Green Belt and other objections are strong countervailing arguments. The requirements of the Equality Act do not give gypsies and travellers or others the right to establish sites in contravention of planning control.
68. I have carefully considered all matters raised. However, based on the evidence before me, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Dakeyne

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jack Parker of Counsel

Instructed by James Hitchcock, the Council's Solicitor

He called

Clifford Thurlow
BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI DMS

Planning Consultant

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alan Masters of Counsel

Instructed by WS Planning and Architecture

He called

John Brien Jnr

Appellant's son

Michael Casey

Appellant's son in law

Brian Woods
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Managing Director of WS Planning and Architecture

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

ID1 Local Plan Policies Map 2019 – Green Belt and Landscape Designations submitted by the Council

ID2 Suggested condition relating to visibility splays submitted by the Council

ID3 Closing submissions by the Council

ID4 Closing submissions by the appellant